Vol. IX, No. 19 HUMAN EVENTS May 7, 1952

THE STAKES OF GERMANY

By William Henry Chamberlin

Germany is the largest single stake of the cold war. Despite defeat in the war, vast bombing destruction, partition and occupation, this country of almost seventy million, with its industry, technical skill and military potential, could tip the scales of the trembling European balance of power one way or the other.

This is why the struggle *with* Germany has long given way to a struggle *for* Germany. This is why the recent Soviet moves, looking to the creation of a neutralized, unified Germany, with its own armed forces, are of first importance on the chessboard of international politics.

Neither side has waged the struggle to win Germany as an ally wholeheartedly and consistently. For, both in the Soviet and in the western camp, recognition of Germany's value is offset by fear and suspicion of what a resurgent Germany might become.

Both sides are handicapped by steps which were taken during the war and in the first phase of the occupation. In mass raping, murdering, looting and general destruction the Russians, in the first months of their conquest of East Germany, behaved with a barbarism unmatched in the annals of European warfare.

More lasting in their effects than these excesses were other features of Soviet political and economic policy. It was Stalin who insisted on amputating from Germany historic eastern provinces, inhabited by a solidly German population of some nine million people, east of the line formed by the rivers Oder and Western Neisse. Most of this territory was assigned to Poland; the Russians annexed the old German city of Koenigsberg, home of the philosopher Kant, and changed its name to Kaliningrad.

Moreover, the Soviet authorities exploited East Germany with ruthless intensity and in various ways. Large Russian occupation forces lived off the country; many billions of dollars were extracted in reparations by carting off everything imaginable, from whole factories to bathtubs and featherbeds; and a considerable part of East German industry was assigned to Soviet ownership and works for Soviet profit.

The Western powers also rolled up liabilities, although less formidable ones, in the present competition for German friendship. They looted German foreign assets and patents, lived in luxurious free quarters at German expense, carried out a capricious and vindictive denazification policy and dismantled a number of German factories, although not on a scale comparable with what happened in East Germany. The small but rich

Copyright 1952 by Human Events, Inc.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saar area was detached from German administration and economically linked with France. On the other hand, the United States put several billion dollars into Germany through Army and ECA appropriations — a circumstance which has no parallel on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

MARCH 10, 1952, may be remembered as the day when position warfare gave way to war of movement in the diplomatic struggle for Germany. Up to that time the division of Germany, while officially deplored, was becoming more and more an accomplished fact. A Soviet puppet regime, self-christened Democratic Republic of Germany, has been set up in the Soviet Zone, marked by subservience to Moscow, political totalitarianism and ever-expanding economic collectivism.

Meanwhile the western part of Germany, which is under American, British and French occupation, has been developing along the lines of free parliamentary institutions and respect for private property. Although there is no historical, political or ethnic justification for the line of demarcation which bisects Germany, the two sections of the country tend to grow farther away in their institutions and their psychology every year.

The Soviet note of March 10 was a much more serious approach to the problem of unity than any earlier communication from Moscow on this subject. Addressed to the three Western powers, it proposed a peace settlement with Germany, an all-German government, acceptance of the mutilated eastern frontier and early withdrawal of all occupation forces. The Soviet note also suggested, for the first time, that Germany should be allowed to maintain its own armed forces, that there should be no discrimination against ex-Nazis, apart from convicted "war criminals", and that Germany, with full freedom to develop its peacetime economy, should be bound to enter into no alliance directed against any of its former enemies.

This note was clearly designed to conjure up an alluring picture for many Germans who are not Communists. This is a Germany not tied to the chariot wheels either of the United States or of the Soviet Union, free to trade with the East as with the West, in possession of its own independent armed forces.

That this Soviet move was designed to disrupt the policy of "integrating" Germany with the West by such devices as the Schuman Plan and the European Army is obvious. What is not so clear is whether Moscow's offer is a bluff or a gamble.

ACID TEST OF SOVIET intentions would be willingness to permit genuinely free voting in East Germany. Prerequisites for such voting would be the release of all political prisoners, establishment of habeas corpus and freedom of speech and press and political association. In short, before any free election could be held in the Soviet Zone, the whole police-state regime which has been built up there would have to be demolished.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is reason for scepticism as to whether the Kremlin intends to let slip its grip on almost twenty million Germans. It is almost certain that remembrance of Russian atrocities, hatred of Soviet exactions, resentment against the bleak and bare living conditions which have prevailed, would insure an overwhelming anti-Communist majority in East Germany, if totalitarian controls were abandoned.

So it is quite probable that when and if negotiations for German unification have advanced to the point where election conditions would be discussed it will be clear that what the Kremlin has in mind is a standard, totalitarian, 99 per cent *Ja* voting formula for East Germany. This would certainly not commend itself to majority opinion in West Germany.

Both the Christian Democrats of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the Social Democrats, largest opposition party, under the leadership of embittered, crippled, passionate Kurt Schumacher, however much they may disagree on other issues, would reject a Trojan Horse scheme patented to repeat the pattern of Czechoslovakia in Germany.

There is, however, an alternative interpretation of the Soviet design. It could be that the Soviet Government is willing to take a big gamble and write off a satellite regime in East Germany for the prospect of an all-German government which would be non-Communist, even anti-Communist in internal policy, but free from binding military and economic commitments to the West. If this is the case, mere negatives will hardly serve the best interests of the United States and its west European allies. It would be disastrous to be maneuvered into the position of seeming to oppose German unity and wishing to perpetuate the division of the country.

Konrad Adenauer, a Catholic and a Rhinelander, is, in all probability, the most western-minded political leader conceivable in post-war Germany. But it would not be good judgment for Washington, Paris and London to push Adenauer too far, to place him, in the eyes of his countrymen, in the position of a puppet of the allies.

Adenauer has a difficult internal situation with which to deal. West Germany, unlike East Germany, is not a totalitarian state. There is freedom of voting and there are several political parties of divergent views. Adenauer heads a moderate conservative coalition with a very small majority. The new election which is to be held next year could unseat him. The pressure of feeling for unity, even in the ranks of his coalition supporters, is reflected in his radio speech late in April, in which he declared that he would rather see Germany united under the Social Democrats than a Germany divided and added: "I would be a bad Christian if I would prefer to leave the Germans in the Soviet Zone to slavery because the majority are Protestants." This was an attempt to dispel the suspicion that Adenauer is not dissatisfied with the present partition because an all-German election would strengthen the Social Democratic and Protestant vote.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MAIN END, the assurance, so far as possible, of Western Europe against Soviet attack, should be more important to western statesmen than any specific means, such as the proposed European Army. (Incidentally, the practical difficulties in the way of forming such an army are very great and preparations have advanced at a snail's pace.)

A united Germany, with a government organized on a basis of free voting, non-Communist and thereby almost certainly anti-Communist, might be more useful for Europe's defense than a sullen and restive West Germany, with a strong popular feeling that unity had been blocked by foreign powers.

The first point to clear up is whether the Soviet offer is a bluff or a gamble. If it is a bluff, it can easily be exposed. All that would be necessary is for the Western powers, in agreement with the Bonn Government, to draw up a charter of political and civil liberties, to be put into effect immediately in East Germany and to function for some time before any election is held.

Rejection of such a proposal should convince Adenauer's principal political opponents, the Social Democrats, that Moscow is not interested in a free Germany. However wrongheaded they may be in their economic views, German Social Democrats are not fellow-travellers. They know they would be marked for swift liquidation if Communism should ever take over.

If unity proves impossible because of Soviet refusal to permit genuinely free voting in East Germany there are several steps the Western powers should take to make "integration" more palatable to the West Germans. They should declare the Yalta and Potsdam decisions null and void. Both were intrinsically immoral; and both have been violated over and over again by the Soviet Union. They should declare that Germany is entitled, in the East, to its 1937 frontier, thereby taking the wind out of the sails of a possible Soviet concession on this point. They should cease collecting occupation costs, making the whole annual German "defense contribution" of about 2.5 billion dollars available for building up a German army. They should make a clean sweep of discriminatory "occupation" regulations and psychology, including the unfortunate tendency of some American officials, like Mr. Benjamin Buttenwieser, to preach unappreciated sermons on democracy.

Germany can be very useful, probably indispensable, as an equal ally. It is worse than useless as an unwilling satellite. If the United States cannot win British and French acceptance of this elementary truth, the whole question of American participation in the ground defense of Europe, scarcely possible without German participation, should be thoroughly re-examined.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. IX, No. 19 Wednesday May 7, 1952 Washington, D. C.

Ike and The Germans: Cautious Republican leaders, who are committed neither to Taft nor to Ike, have begun anxiously to scan the Eisenhower record, particularly his term as commander in Germany. These leaders, familiar with the guile of the Democratic Administration, realize that if Ike were nominated GOP candidate for the Presidency, the Democrats would then have no inhibitions about revealing — in the heat of the fall campaign — some indisputable facts about Eisenhower.

Therefore, these leaders are immensely disturbed by a certain well-documented episode which, if it were widely publicized, not only would shock the humanitarian sensibilities of the country as a whole, but might have particularly lamentable effects on voters of German stock. The story is, as follows:

Eisenhower was commander of the occupation in Germany in 1945, up until November 19 when he became Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army and returned to Washington. General Lucius Clay succeeded him. In 1946, Clay and other Western Allied officers discovered to their dismay that Soviet authorities in the Eastern Zone had been deporting very large numbers of Germans to Russia for slave labor. According to some reports, there were as many as 500,000 deportees, but as of today the Congressional Library estimates that the total was about 200,000. The exact figures, because of Soviet non-cooperation, cannot be accurately obtained. At any rate, the question became acute among Allied commanders, for — among other reasons — the fact that in the Nuremberg trials the mass deportation of workers for slave labor by the Germans was labelled as one of the most heinous of war crimes.

Clay raised the question at a four-power meeting of Allied commanders in Berlin. Under Berlin date line, November 13, 1946, Marguerite Higgins (the now celebrated woman correspondent) reported to the New York *Herald Tribune* that General Clay had strongly protested these deportations. The General read the words of the charter of the International Military Tribunal: "War crimes shall include . . . deportations for slave labor or for any other purpose of the civilian population of or in an occupied territory."

But the Soviet commander present had the last word. He read a decision of the Allied commanders in 1945 which provided authority for such deportations. The Western commanders had forgotten this, and as Miss Higgins reports it, the conference "suddenly fizzled to an embarrassed silence". As well it might.

For we have before us now a photostat of the document of the Allied Control Authority in Germany, "Control Council, Proclamation, No. 2. Certain Requirements Imposed on Germany". Section VI of this interesting document runs as follows:

> "The German authorities will carry out, for the benefit of the United Nations, such measures of restitution, reinstatement, restoration, reparation, reconstruction, relief and rehabilitation as the Allied Representatives may prescribe. For these purposes the German authorities will effect or procure the surrender or transfer of such property, assets, rights, titles and interests, effect such deliveries and carry out such repair, building and construction work, whether in Germany or elsewhere, and will provide such transport, plant, equipment and materials of all kinds, labor, personnel and specialist and other services, for use in Germany or elsewhere, as the Allied Representatives may direct." [Our emphasis.]

The broad term "elsewhere" clearly gave Russian commanders legal authorization for sending German slave labor into Soviet Russia.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Was General Clay confounded by his own act? Not at all. It was not Clay's responsibility for okaying the above extraordinary document. For, at the end of the document (below the words "done at Berlin, the 20th of September, 1945") is the signature of none other than General Dwight D. Eisenhower (together with the signatures of the other Allied commanders).

Now, the above-mentioned GOP politicians have been profoundly impressed — indeed depressed — by inspection of this document. They may privately excuse Eisenhower on the ground that he was careless, lacked foresight and showed foolish trust in the future good faith of Soviet Russia. Nevertheless, they agree that he must bear the responsibility for the deportation into slave labor in Russia of an estimated 200,000 Germans, an act classified by the International Military Tribunal as a "war crime".

If Ike should receive the nomination at the GOP convention, that would be difficult to explain.

The Price of Alliance: When, four months ago, we predicted that the Mutual Security Administration (successor to ECA) would outrage American businessmen by awarding contracts abroad rather than at home, we only scratched the surface of this matter.

We did not envision then an outrageous orgy of profiteering at the expense of the American taxpayer and to the profit of foreign firms. Nor did we foresee how tight the censorship would be after Truman's famous "secrecy" orders.

However, the field of business and international trade is less tight-lipped than the Pentagon and other agencies of the Government. And so from business circles, we have obtained the following information which, when thrown in the face of Pentagon circles, has met with firm silence.

It is this. The Mutual Security Agency has placed large orders with French factories for the production of weapons for the European Army. (The MSA uses American taxpayers' money to pay these firms for these weapons.) In one category of weapons — mortars — considerable orders have been placed. These mortars, we are reliably informed, could be produced and sold at a profit by American firms for the sum of about $1,000 each. The French firms, however, are billing the Mutual Security Agency at the rate of $8,800 each. At that rate, they can hardly find bankruptcy staring them in the face.

Nor is that all. The mortar situation has been sedulously kept from the press. But the literal racket of the "port taxes" has just leaked out to the press and is straining the patience of American administrators. Over last weekend, many papers ran an A.P. dispatch (May 3, Paris date line) that "French port fees are costing the United States $6 for every American officer and more than $2 for every enlisted man landed in France, its partner in Western defense". In addition, the A.P. reports on a "system of French indirect taxes" which takes $1 for every $5 that the American taxpayer shells out for military construction work in France". The United States, according to the A.P. dispatch, has "opened negotiations with France to cut these impositions on the American taxpayers' burden".

Seizure: As we go to press, Senator Jenner (R., Ind.) is speaking in the Senate on the great constitutional question of the day. From an advance release of his speech, we cull the following solemn warning: "It is true that our courts have spoken. Judge David A. Pine has restated the honored doctrine of the English-speaking people that government has no inherent powers to operate outside the framework of the law. But let us not fall into the prevailing delusion. Court decisions are not self-enforcing. The courts state the Law but they do not enforce it. If the Executive wants to obey the Law, the problem is closed when the court has spoken. If the Executive does not want to obey the Law, the Government appears to obey but the slow erosion of the rule of Law goes on, from a hundred hidden pressures."

Jenner went on: "We dare not deceive ourselves. This conflict over the steel seizure is not ended. We do not know what the Supreme Court will say, but even if the highest court upholds Judge Pine, we have not converted the Executive branch to respect for Law. The power to defy the courts is theirs, the means are theirs. Their attack on the rule of Law, their continuous building up of unrestrained power, will go on day and night so long as they have control of our resources."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Eisenhower Situation: Senator Duff of Pennsylvania, according to the pro-Eisenhower, left-wing *New York Post* (May 3) is "just about ready to explode at the campaign tactics being used in the Eisenhower-for-President movement. He's especially annoyed with Governor Dewey and Herbert Brownell who managed the Governor's ill-fated 1948 Presidential campaign". The New York paper says Duff does not believe Ike can survive if he fails to speak out frankly on all issues; the "silence" strategy of Ike is attributed to Dewey influence. It was this kind of strategy which defeated the New York Governor in 1948. Duff, says the *Post,* finds his advice ignored.

The above report came right on the heels of the *Chicago Tribune* stories of April 30 and May 1, claiming that Duff has in effect deserted the Ike cause, cancelled speaking engagements and found it necessary to take a rest. Duff denied this. The *Tribune* proceeded to reproduce a cable from a friend of Duff, and a prominent Eisenhower supporter, James Bennett, sent in recent weeks to Ike. In this communication, Bennett says: "There is most valid reason for grave concern regarding your delegate strength on the floor of the convention in Chicago. Were the ballot to be held today Taft would unquestionably be nominated on the first ballot by a considerable plurality. . . . While we have picked up the headlines, Taft has been garnering delegates." Finally the *Wall Street Journal* on May 6 reported trouble in the Ike camp, with uncertainty about not only Duff's but also Sen. Lodge's sojourn on the Eisenhower bandwagon. The *Journal* found the Dewey influence over the Ike movement predominant, and reported political opinion to the effect that this would adversely affect Ike's popularity among delegates. "The current power tussle", says that paper, "could put General Eisenhower in an awkward spot on the eve of his return to the U.S. to campaign. He may find himself in a position where he has to take sides or somehow pacify the contenders."

Briefs: We have received a report that Tom Girdler of Republic Steel Corporation (long the *bete noire* of Labor and the Left) favors Eisenhower for President. "Liberal" papers please copy.

General A. C. Wedemeyer (of the "Wedemeyer Report") accepted the Presidency of the newly formed Citizens Committee for Taft. It is rumored that Ike had sent George Allen (Truman's former "court jester") to Wedemeyer in a vain attempt to persuade him not to take the Taft committee job.

. . . . Will former Congressman Fred Hartley soon barnstorm for Taft? The idea is around the House, largely due to his co-authorship with Taft of the famous labor bill. GOP Congressmen offer the argument that Hartley would speak with great effect in coming weeks which are expected to be marked by much labor strife.

. . . . Some sardonic remarks are being made about the fact that the Fair Deal Government in its brief for steel seizure cited the Debs-Pullman case of the Nineties, when Federal troops and the injunction power were used to break a railroad strike. For decades thereafter, Labor used this case as an example of tyrannical Federal power.

. . . . Sen. Dirksen's name comes up noticeably more often these days, in connection with talk of a deadlock at the GOP convention and a compromise candidate. For some reason, MacArthur's name appears less frequently.

. . . . We hear that H. L. Hunt, wealthy oilman who wants MacArthur for President, suggested to the General that the latter — as a great political stroke — should go to the Kentucky Derby and make the prize awards. The General and/or his secretary promptly rejected the idea.

The Rumely Story: Dr. Edward A. Rumely and his Committee for Constitutional Government won a signal victory for a free press when the Court of Appeals last week reversed the Rumely conviction (by a lower court) and ordered his indictment dismissed. The Court of Appeals and Rumely are to be congratulated on this successful blow to encroachment of centralized government on the rights of the individual.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Rumely story begins with his persecution at the hands of the notorious Buchanan Committee of the House of the 81st Congress. Following the Truman victory of 1948, the Fair Deal obviously set out — according to a specific totalitarian plan, we believe — to stifle all remaining vestiges of political literature critical of the ruling class. The Buchanan Committee, under the pretense of pursuing lobbying evils (but not, of course, lobbying by labor or the Executive), subjected Rumely to the most flagrant of inquisitions.

But the leader of the Committee on Constitutional Government is one of that durable breed of old editors who learned how to fight in the era of 1910 to 1920. He refused flatly to give the Buchanan goon squad the names and addresses of all organizations or persons who had bought books in the amount of $500 or more from the Committee on Constitutional Government. (Notable among these books distributed by Rumely were a bound volume of the Constitution of the United States and *The Road Ahead* by John T. Flynn.) As a result of the Buchanan probe, the Department of Justice (more alert at persecuting believers in the Constitution than plain and fancy crooks) asked for and got an indictment, then prosecuted Rumely in the District Court, where he was convicted of contempt of Congress for failure to produce the lists.

(The real strategy of the Buchanan conspirators — observers believe — was that by publication of the lists, the Executive arm of the Government would be enabled to: (1) intimidate wealthy contributors to such conservative organizations as Rumely's; and (2) to lay open the purchasers to persecution — by boycott or pressure — from various "liberal" hatchet groups.)

But when Rumely took his conviction to the Court of Appeals he found there the same sturdy constitutionalists as did the steel companies when they encountered Judge Pine.

Fourth Estate: The Pulitzer awards this week included a prize to the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* for muck-raking the Internal Revenue Bureau scandals. It may be that the paper mentioned was the first paper to jump into the fray. But as for the fray itself the remark of Walter Trohan, Chief of the Washington Bureau of the *Chicago Tribune*, is worth quoting: "It is sad to contemplate, but true, that the Internal Revenue Bureau scandal, one of the most sordid in our history, was not broken by the press, but by a lone Senator [Williams of Delaware], armed with nothing but persistence to get at the truth. And it becomes sadder still when it is remembered there are more than 1,200 reporters in Washington and they are regarded as the cream of the crop."

Mr. Trohan's remarks were part of a speech he delivered to the Midwestern Association of Professors of Political Science at Notre Dame on April 24 — in which he criticized the "pay-off" and "handout" practices of the press, just as severely as he did in his piece, "The Decline of the Fourth Estate", in the December, 1951, issue of HUMAN EVENTS.

"Academic Freedom": Dr. Walter E. Spahr, chairman of the Department of Economics at New York University, gives us a startling instance of the interpretation of "academic freedom" which obtains in our schools of higher learning. For twenty years, he tells us, a compendium of economic essays, *Economic Principles and Problems*, of which he was editor (and one of the authors), had been in use in a number of colleges; the other authors were also professors of economics, all schooled in the classical tradition. The book had gone through four editions. The fifth edition, however, could find no publisher. For, the Economics departments had advised the publishers that the book did not conform to the collectivist doctrines of Lord Keynes and therefore was unusable. That is to say, there exists a taboo on books which do not teach the "truth", as defined by those who monopolize the economics departments in most of our colleges.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1136 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change in address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED